



Serial No. 10/043,265
Attorney Docket No. WLJ.056CIP
Response to Election/Restriction dated October 15, 2003

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re PATENT APPLICATION of

Leslie Michael LEA et al.

Group Art Unit: 1763

Serial No: 10/043,265

Examiner: Luz L. Alejandro Mulero

Filed: January 14, 2002

For: PLASMA PROCESSING APPARATUS

RESPONSE TO ELECTION/RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
2011 South Clark Place
Customer Window, Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment
Crystal Plaza Two, Lobby, Room 1B03
Arlington, VA 22202

Sir:

In response to the Office Action of September 26, 2003, Applicants elect the invention of Group I, Claims 1-23, drawn to an apparatus. The election is with traverse.

As described in MPEP 803, "There are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction between patentably distinct inventions: (A) The inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed; and (B) There must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required." (Emphasis added.) A side-by-side comparison of apparatus claim 1 and method claim 24 is shown below:

Serial No. 10/043,265
Attorney Docket No. WLJ.056CIP
Response to Election/Restriction dated October 15, 2003

Claim 1	Claim 24
A plasma processing apparatus comprising	A method of controlling the transmission of a plasma to a workpiece
a first chamber provided with a plasma inducing device designed to produce a plasma in said first chamber	plasma is created in a first chamber provided by a plasma inducing device
a second chamber into which plasma so produced can diffuse to act upon a workpiece being processed	[plasma] is allowed to diffuse into a second chamber to act upon a workpiece being processed
a magnetic field production device positioned relative to at least the first of said two chambers and	an attenuation magnetic field production device positioned relative to at least the first of said two chambers is
constructed to cause attenuation of the ions which diffuse into the second chamber and approach the workpiece	operated in a manner to cause attenuation of the ions which diffuse into the second chamber and approach the workpiece
by directing a proportion of the ions to a loss surface of either chamber	by directing a proportion of the ions to a loss surface of either chamber

As is apparent from the above, claims 1 and 24 are so closely worded that Applicants respectfully contend that no serious burden is placed on the Examiner by the examination of both sets of claims.

*Serial No. 10/043,265
Attorney Docket No. WLJ.056CIP
Response to Election/Restriction dated October 15, 2003*

Accordingly, the election of apparatus claims 1-23 is with traverse.

Respectfully submitted,

VOLENTINE FRANCOS, PLLC



Adam C. Volentine
Registration No. 33,289

12200 Sunrise Valley Drive, Suite 150
Reston, Virginia 20191
Telephone No.: (703) 715-0870
Facsimile No.: (703) 715-0877

Dated: October 15, 2003